

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 29-50 are pending, in which claims 29 and 42 are currently amended, and no claims are canceled, withdrawn, or newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed November 17, 2005 rejected claims 29-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *O'Neil et al.* (U.S. 6,226,364). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of all pending claims, as *O'Neil et al.* fails to disclose the features of the claims.

In the interests of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 29 and 42 to recite receipt by the web portal of “a selection of one of the prepaid services input by the user.” Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by *O'Neil et al.*

Independent claim 49 recites (*emphasis added*):

49. (Previously Presented) A computer-implemented method for providing prepaid services, the method comprising:  
communicating with a plurality of databases that include a first prepaid database supporting a prepaid service of a first provider, and a second prepaid database supporting prepaid service of a second provider; and  
presenting, via a web interface, the prepaid service of the first provider and the prepaid service of the second provider as a bundled service.

The Office Action (pp. 2-3) does not address the specific features recited by claim 49, but apparently relies on its rejection of claim 1 to additionally support the rejection of claim 49. The rejection cites col. 1: 17-18; col. 9:29-41; col. 4: 49-65; col. 16: 1-20; and Figs. 2-4 of *O'Neil et al.* However, none of these cited portions of *O'Neil et al.* pertains to “presenting, via a web interface, the prepaid service of the first provider and the prepaid service of the second provider as a bundled service,” and the Office Action does not explicitly contend that any of these portions of *O'Neil et al.* disclose this feature recited by claim 49. In fact, the only reference made by the Office Action to any “bundled-service” is contained in the rejection of dependent

claims 39 and 46 (Office Action, p. 4), which cites col. 2: 54 – col. 3: 3 of *O'Neil et al.* However, this cited portion of *O'Neil et al.* merely refers to packaging a prepaid telephone service card for sale with a new cellular telephone to encourage the purchaser to select the issuer of the card as the purchaser's cellular telephone provider, or using prepaid telephone service cards as advertising media to be passed out at conventions, or issuing a cellular telephone with a prepaid account balance to a hotel or resort guest. Nowhere does *O'Neil et al.* disclose or suggest “presenting, via a web interface, the prepaid service of the first provider and the prepaid service of the second provider as a bundled service” as recited by claim 49.

To anticipate, every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim. *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383, 58 USPQ2d 1286, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Inherent anticipation requires that the missing descriptive material is “necessarily present,” not merely probably or possibly present, in the prior art. *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citing *Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1268, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). *O'Neil et al.* fails to anticipate claim 49, and thus, the rejection of claim 49 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 30-41, 43-48, and 50 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, and are separately patentable on their own merits. For example, dependent claims 39 and 46 each recite, “the web portal presents the plurality of prepaid services as a prepaid bundled-service package.” However, as discussed previously, the Office Action (p.

4) cites col. 2: 54 – col. 3: 3 of *O'Neil et al.* as disclosing this feature. As discussed previously, this cited portion of *O'Neil et al.* merely refers to packaging a prepaid telephone service card for sale with a new cellular telephone to encourage the purchaser to select the issuer of the card as the purchaser's cellular telephone provider, or using prepaid telephone service cards as advertising media to be passed out at conventions, or issuing a cellular telephone with a prepaid account balance to a hotel or resort guest. None of this portion of *O'Neil et al.* has anything to do with any type of presentation via a web interface. Moreover, nowhere does *O'Neil et al.* disclose “presenting, via a web interface, the prepaid service of the first provider and the prepaid service of the second provider as a bundled service” as clearly recited by dependent claims 39 and 46, and thus, the rejection of claims 39 and 46 should be withdrawn.


Therefore, the rejections of all pending claims should be withdrawn.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 425-8508 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & MORI, P.C.

2/17/06  
Date

  
Reg. No. 44,658  
Margo Livesay, Ph.D.  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 41,946

10507 Braddock Road  
Suite A  
Fairfax, VA 22032  
Tel. (703) 425-8508  
Fax. (703) 425-8518